1 (Case called)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Good afternoon, your Honor, David Abramowicz for the government.

MR. FARKAS: Good afternoon, your Honor, Michael Farkas for Ms. Levin.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

I understand this is the first appearance of the defendant, is that correct?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: It is, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Levin, if you would rise, please.

I wish to inform you, ma'am, that you have the right to remain silent.

You understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You do not need to make any statement whatsoever. Even if you have already made any statement to the law enforcement authorities, you do not have to make any additional statement. I will also wish to inform you that any statements that you do make can be used against you.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You have the right to be represented by an attorney today and at all other future proceedings in this case, and if you are unable to afford an attorney, I will appoint an attorney to represent you.

| 1 | Do you understand those rights? |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Have you retained an attorney? |
| 4 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Who is that? |
| 6 | THE DEFENDANT: Michael Farkas. |
| 7 | THE COURT: The parties want an arraignment separate |
| 8 | from the guilty plea. Is that what the parties want at this |
| 9 | point? |
| 10 | MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor. |
| 11 | THE COURT: I will do that. |
| 12 | MR. FARKAS: Yes. |
| 13 | THE COURT: Ms. Levin, have you received a copy of the |
| 14 | superseding information in this case, S2 21 CR 221? |
| 15 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. |
| 16 | THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Farkas? |
| 17 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Did he answer all of your questions about |
| 19 | that superseding information? |
| 20 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes. |
| 21 | THE COURT: You have the right to have me read that |
| 22 | superseding information right now in open court. But if you |
| 23 | don't want me to, I won't. You want me to read it or do you |
| 24 | waive my reading of it? |
| 25 | THE DEFENDANT: Waive your reading of it. |
| ļ | |

THE COURT: I accept that as a waiver of the right to have the superseding information read.

Now, the parties apparently wish to have an arraignment here before there is a plea.

How do you plead to the charges against you at this point in that superseding information?

THE DEFENDANT: Not guilty.

THE COURT: I accept your plea of not guilty. Thank you.

I take it the parties are asking for an allocution on the superseding information, is that correct?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor. You mean a plea proceeding?

THE COURT: Yes. I'm sorry. I should have said that. Plea proceedings rather than allocution.

Mr. Farkas, tell me what you want, sir.

MR. FARKAS: Your Honor, the government and my client have been in discussions for quite some time, and my client has been proffered a plea agreement which she has signed and accepted. It would require her to plead guilty to Count One of the superseding information, with various stipulations as to guidelines ranges and other standard conditions that are usually found in plea agreements.

THE COURT: She has just entered a plea of not guilty.

I take it at this point you want her to withdraw -- you are

21

23

22

25

24

under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist?

understand English? THE DEFENDANT: I am. THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been

THE COURT: Are you able to read, write, speak, and

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Ms. Levin's competence to plead at this time?

2 MR. FARKAS: No doubt, your Honor.

MR. FARNAS. NO doubt, your nonor.

THE COURT: A moment ago Mr. Farkas told me you wish to enter a plea of guilty to Count One of the superseding information against you. Is that true? Do you wish to now enter a plea of guilty.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss your case with Mr. Farkas and to discuss the consequences of entering a plea of guilty today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with Mr. Farkas and his representation of you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: On the basis of Ms. Levin's responses to my questions and my observations of her demeanor, she stands here before me today, which is the first time in this proceeding that I have seen her, I make the finding that she is fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time.

Before I accept a plea from you, I am going to be asking you certain questions, Ms. Levin. My questions are intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because you are guilty and that you fully understand the consequences of entering a plea of guilt today.

I am going to be describing to you certain rights you

have under the Constitution and laws of the United States. You are going to be giving up those rights if you enter a plea of guilty. So listen to me carefully. If you do not understand anything I am saying or describing to you, I want you to stop me. You can ask me anything you want. You can ask Mr. Farkas anything you want.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have a right to speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you, which are contained in superseding information S2 21 CR 221.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would be presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove you were innocent at a trial.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You have a right to be represented by an attorney at trial and at every other stage of the proceedings. And if you could not afford an attorney, one will be provided to you at no cost to you.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have a right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you and your attorney could cross-examine them. You would have the right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and offer evidence on your own behalf, if you so desired, and you would have the right to have subpoenas issues or other compulsory process used to compel witnesses to testify in your own defense.

Do you understand all those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you to testify if you did not want to. In addition, no inference or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you decided not to testify at a trial.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You understand that by entering a plea of guilty today, you are giving up each and every one of the

rights I have described, you are waiving them, and that there will be no trial here?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: You understand that you have the right to change your mind right now and refuse to enter a plea of guilty. You don't have to enter a plea of guilty for any reason whatsoever.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: I do.

THE COURT: I asked you this before, but I am going to ask you again. Have you received a copy of the superseding information in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Did you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Farkas?

THE DEFENDANT: I did.

THE COURT: A moment ago you waived my reading of it.

I am going to ask you the same question. You have the right to have me read that superseding information in open court right now, but if you don't want me to read it, I won't.

What is your choice?

THE DEFENDANT: Not to read it.

THE COURT: I accept that.

Now, I said you are charged in this instrument, which

is a superseding information. You understand that you have a right under the Constitution of the United States to be charged by an indictment, by a grand jury instead of by an information, which is simply a charge by the government?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I have a document in front of me which I

am going to ask my deputy to mark as Government Exhibit 1. It says: The above-named defendant, and you are the above named defendant, Sheina Levin, who is accused of violating 18 U.S.C. 1349, being advised of the nature of the charge and of her rights, hereby waives in open court prosecution by indictment and consents that the proceeding may be by information instead of by indictment.

I am going to ask my deputy to show you that document, and I am going to ask you if that's your signature.

Is that your signature?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Do you understand you have waived the right to be charged by an indictment and you have consented to being charged by an information by the government instead of an indictment by a grand jury?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Did you waive that right voluntarily and knowingly?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you did not plead guilty, the government would have to prove each and every element of the charge in Count One beyond a reasonable doubt at a trial.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Abramowicz, set forth what the elements are that the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt before a jury could convict this defendant.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Your Honor, the conspiracy charged in the information has two elements: First, that the defendant devised or participated in a scheme to defraud organization 1 of its right to the honest services of its president and CEO, Victor Rivera, through bribery or kickbacks; second, that the defendant devised or participated in that scheme knowingly and with an intent to defraud.

I'm sorry, your Honor. If I may start again.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: I was reading the elements of the substantive offense. I am going to have to do that again.

The conspiracy elements are: First, that the defendant and at least one person entered into a conspiracy to commit honest services wire fraud; and, second, that the defendant entered into that conspiracy knowingly and willfully.

That underlying honest services wire fraud has four elements: First, that the defendant devised or participated in

1 a scheme to defraud, in this case, organization 1, of its right 2 to the honest services of its president and CEO, Victor Rivera, 3 through bribery or kickbacks; second, that the defendant 4 devised or participated in that scheme knowingly and with an 5 intent to defraud; third, that the scheme or artifice to 6 defraud involved a material misrepresentation, false statement, 7 false pretense, or concealment of material fact; and, fourth, 8 that in advancing or furthering or carrying out the scheme to 9 defraud, the defendant transmitted or caused to be transmitted 10 the writings, signs, signal, picture, or sound alleged by means 11 of a wire communication in interstate commerce.

Your Honor, the government at a trial would also need to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that venue in the Southern District of New York is appropriate.

THE COURT: You understand, with the exception of the venue requirement, those are the elements the government would have to prove beyond a reasonable doubt at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The venue requirement is simply a requirement that the government has to prove at least one act in connection with the conspiracy took place in the Southern District of New York. That has to be proven by the government simply by a preponderance of the evidence rather than beyond a reasonable doubt.

Do you understand that?

1 | THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum possible penalty of Count One, that is, the crime that you are pleading guilty to, is 20 years in prison, plus the maximum term of supervised release of three years, plus the maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000, or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to individuals other than you resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I also must order restitution to anyone injured as a result of your criminal conduct.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: When I was reading what the maximum penalty was, part of that was a maximum term of supervised release of three years. Supervised release means you are going to be subject to monitoring upon your release from prison and the monitoring will be under terms and conditions that could lead to your reimprisonment without a jury trial for all or part of the term of supervised release and without credit for time previously served on postrelease supervision if you violate any term or condition of supervised release.

Do you understand that?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You understand that if I accept your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty, that determination may deprive you of such valuable rights as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Government, I take it the defendant is a United States citizen?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Levin, under current law, there are sentencing guidelines that judges must use in applying the factors set forth in Section 3553(a) to determine what an appropriate sentence is in this case.

Have you talked to Mr. Farkas about the sentencing quidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Did he answer your questions about them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand I won't be able to determine what the relevant guideline range is until after I receive a presentence report that's been completed by the probation department and you and the government have had a chance to challenge any of the facts reported by the probation department?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, at some point the probation department is going to interview you. I want you to give them accurate and complete information. Mr. Farkas will have the right to be there, if he wishes. I am going to use that report in determining what an appropriate guideline range is.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that even after I determine what the appropriate guideline range is in your case, I have the ability to impose a sentence based on a departure of the guidelines. In other words, I can sentence you to something higher than that called for by the guidelines or I can sentence you to something lower than that called for by the guidelines on the basis of the departure.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Even after I determine that, that is, whether there are grounds to depart either upward or downward on the basis of the departure, I then must apply all of the factors in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a) to determine what a fair and reasonable and appropriate sentence is and one that's sufficient but not greater than necessary to meet the ends of the criminal justice system.

Do you understand that process of sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that when you are sentenced to prison or if you are sentenced to prison, the system of parole that used to exist in the federal criminal justice system no longer exists. Parole has been abolished. When I sentence you to a certain number of months in prison, you will serve those months in prison. You will not be released any earlier on parole.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You understand that if Mr. Farkas or anyone else has tried to tell you what your sentence shall be or will be or could be or may be, and that includes the government, for that matter, all of those prognostications or assumptions or suggestions could be wrong.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: That's because I'm the one who is going to sentence you, and I have no idea what your sentence is going to be because I don't know enough about you, and indeed this is the first time I've seen you. I don't know enough about your upbringing, your finances, your history, whether you have any criminal history, your family circumstances. I know something about this crime because Mr. Rivera has been convicted here, but I need to know more. I need to know specifically what you

did, what you admit you did. Since I don't know enough about you to know what your sentence is going to be, and I'm the one who is going to sentence you, Ms. Levin, nobody can know what your sentence is going to be.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If you are sentenced to something that you are not expecting or sentenced to something that is different than what somebody told you your sentence was going to be, you still are going to be bound to this guilty plea and you won't be allowed to withdraw it.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: I have a document in front of me. It's dated January 17. It's to Mr. Farkas, six pages long. It's signed by Mr. Abramowicz. I am going to refer to it as the plea agreement. I am going to ask my deputy to mark it as Government Exhibit 2. I am going to ask her to show you the last page.

Is that your signature on the last page?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Did you read that agreement before you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Farkas before

1 you signed it? 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Did you understand it at the time you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Does that letter agreement, Government Exhibit Number 2, constitute your complete and total understanding of the entire agreement between the government, Mr. Farkas, and yourself?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Is everything about your plea and sentence contained in that agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: I believe so.

THE COURT: Are there any side deals I should know about, anything that's been left out of that agreement that I need to know about?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Is everything about your plea and sentence contained in that agreement that you are aware of?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that I'm aware of.

THE COURT: Has anyone offered you any inducements or threatened you or forced you to plead quilty or to enter into the plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in this plea

25

agreement you have admitted the forfeiture allegation, and you have agreed to forfeit to the United States \$790,835.06, which represents the proceeds traceable to the commission of the offense to which you have pled. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Do you also understand that in this agreement you have agreed to make restitution to the Bronx Parent Housing Network, Inc. in the amount of \$838,880.78.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you understand that in this agreement you have waived the right to appeal the sentence and you have waived the right to bring a collateral attack to the sentence if I sentence you to 37 months in prison or fewer months?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions for me about that?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you have waived any defense based on the statute of limitations?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Farkas, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at trial or know of any reason why Ms. Levin should not be permitted to plead guilty?

1 MR. FARKAS: I do not, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: In your view, sir, is there an adequate 3 factual basis to support your client's plea? 4 MR. FARKAS: Yes. 5 THE COURT: In the view of the government, is there an adequate factual basis to support Ms. Levin's plea? 6 7 MR. ABRAMOWICZ: There is, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Levin, tell me what you did in connection with Count One of superseding information S2 21 CR 9 10 221. 11 MR. FARKAS: Your Honor, with my assistance, Ms. Levin 12 has drafted a statement in this regard. May she sit and be 13 able to read it into the microphone? 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 What I do need to know, though, is that everything you 16 are about to tell me is true. Is it? 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 18 THE COURT: You may be seated. When people read, they 19 tend to speed up. When they are nervous, they tend to speed 20 So I am going to ask you to read it slowly and clearly so 21 I can understand what you are admitting to and the court 22 reporter can take it down for the record. 23 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

Some time ago I met Victor Rivera, who was then president and

I am a real estate broker operating my own business.

24

25

CEO of a not-for-profit organization called Bronx Parent
Housing Network, or BPHN, which is located in the Southern
District of New York.

Mr. Rivera and I arranged for BPHN to sublease properties from my company in order to facilitate BPHN's housing of homeless persons within those properties.

Mr. Rivera knew that I would make a profit on these arrangements due to my direct lease agreements with the owners of those properties.

When our subleases with BPHN were being arranged, Mr. Rivera demanded that he personally receive a cut of my company's profits, stating that he was responsible for the company getting BPHN's subleases.

As a result, from about May 2019 through January 2021, I paid a portion of my company's profits to Mr. Rivera indirectly. I did this by sending U.S. currency at his direction to an entity that he controlled but was not listed in his name, so that Mr. Rivera could hide those payments from BPHN. I knew that by doing so -- I knew that doing so would enable the subleases to go forward and that these payments were improper.

THE COURT: What years did you do these things?

THE DEFENDANT: From 2019 -- May 2019 to approximately

January 2021.

THE COURT: What borough were you in when you did

N3946EYP21-cr-00221-SHS Document 67 Filed 04/07/23 Page 23 of 27 23 1 these, when you gave this currency? What county were you in? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Brooklyn. 3 THE COURT: Was BPHN Mr. Rivera's entity in Manhattan, 4 if you know? THE DEFENDANT: They are in the Bronx. 5 6 THE COURT: They are in the Bronx. Thank you. 7 Government, anything else on the factual allocution? 8 MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Your Honor, I would like to just 9 proffer some evidence for the interstate wire element. 10 The government can proffer that it has evidence that 11 Ms. Levin and Mr. Rivera communicated by email in furtherance 12 of the scheme and that some of those communications were sent 13 or received in the Southern District of New York and traveled 14 through Google servers located outside New York State. 15 THE COURT: Do you accept that proffer, Mr. Farkas? 16 MR. FARKAS: I do, your Honor. Thank you. 17 THE COURT: Ms. Levin, when you did the acts you just 18 told me about, did you know that what you were doing was wrong 19 and illegal? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Government, tell me what evidence you have 22 here.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor.

23

24

25

At a trial, the evidence against the defendant would include financial records showing Ms. Levin's payments to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

them knowingly and voluntarily, because I find your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential

elements of the offense, I accept your guilty plea and I determine you to be guilty of the offense to which you have pled.

I have in front of me a consent preliminary order of forfeiture in the sum of \$790,835.06, and I am signing that consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment.

Date for sentencing is set as June 28 at 2:30 p.m.

MR. FARKAS: One moment, your Honor, please.

Your Honor, would you prefer that we try to set a date right now that I can verify with the government will work for both of us, or do you prefer that we contact chambers --

THE COURT: I thought I just said it, June 28. Is there any issue with June 28?

MR. FARKAS: I may be traveling that week, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's do it when you are not traveling.

MR. FARKAS: I believe that I should be back the week of July 10.

THE COURT: July 12, 2:30 p.m.

Is there any application with regard to bail?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: Yes, your Honor. The parties have agreed upon and proposed conditions of the defendant's release, and I can recite those to you.

We propose that the defendant be required to surrender her passport, which she has done, and that she be released on a \$100,000 personal recognizance bond with her travel restricted

to the Southern, Eastern, and Northern Districts of New York, the Southern District of Florida, and the District of Connecticut, with additional temporary travel as approved by pretrial services and the government, and that she be subject to pretrial services' supervision as directed.

In the pretrial report there is also a proposal that she not contact any codefendants, victims, or witnesses unless in the presence of counsel. We would consent to that, except we would just take out witnesses, just to enable her to communicate with family members who may be witnesses. And there is also.

THE COURT: Just a moment.

What are you asking for in regard to no contact with codefendant's victims or witnesses, unless in the presence of counsel? What are you asking?

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: We would just ask to remove witnesses, only because there are some family members who may technically be witnesses.

THE COURT: Fine. It will be no contact with codefendant or victims, unless in the presence of counsel.

MR. ABRAMOWICZ: The government has no objection to the fifth proposed condition from pretrial, which is the mental health evaluation and treatment as directed.

THE COURT: That's a joint proposal?

MR. FARKAS: Yes, your Honor.

25